



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2002

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/806,136	03/26/2001	Kenichi Nakanishi	450106-02621	5076
. 75	90 12/02/2002			
William S Frommer			EXAMINER	
Frommer Lawrence & Haug 745 Fifth Avenue			ENCARNACION, YAMIR	
New York, NY	10151		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		1/2			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
. Office Action Comments	09/806,136	NAKANISHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Yamir Encarnacion	2186			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 M	<u>March 2001</u> .				
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under					
Disposition of Claims AVM Claim(a) 1.6 is/are pending in the application					
 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 	un from consideration				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	wit from consideration.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement				
Application Papers	· cicciion roquiromani.				
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2001 is/are: a	a) \square accepted or b) \boxtimes objected to by	the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •			
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)□ approved b)□ disappro	oved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•				
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority document					
Certified copies of the priority documents					
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bu See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesti					
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pro 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domesting 					
Attachment(s)	. ,				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4	5) Notice of Informal I	/ (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/806,136 Page 2

Art Unit: 2186

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because sheet 15 of the drawings supplied is redundant. It

appears to the examiner that the labels on sheet 15 are not needed in view of page 15, lines 7-24

of the written description. Also, the sheet is not a "Figure" and is not mentioned in the section

titled "Brief Description of Drawings." It appears to the examiner that sheet 15 should not be

part of the figures. A proposed drawing correction, or corrected drawings are required in reply to

the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not

be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

In page 14, line 10 replace "Fig. 13" with --Figs. 13A and 13B--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject

matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing

to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

Art Unit: 2186

5. The limitation "the parallel writing" on line 27 appears for the first time and appears to lack antecedent basis. It appears to the examiner that applicant meant lines 25-26 read "and writing data in parallel into the designated cluster address." The examiner has interpreted claim 6 for purposes of this Office Action as if it had read "and writing data in parallel into the designated cluster address" on lines 25-26. Either clarification as to what applicant intended or amendment of the claim is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estakhri

(USPN: 6,081,878) in view of Smith (USPN: 5,860,082).

Claimed	Estakhri
1. A data processing system in which a non	See figure 5.
volatile memory apparatus	
having a plurality of storages	See figure 5, non volatile memory units 508.

Application/Control Number: 09/806,136

Art Unit: 2186

In Estakhri, each block (which reads on the
claimed "cluster") includes 32 sectors in the
preferred embodiment. See column 7, lines
45-48.
Not clearly shown.
Estakhri suggests that memory card 502 could
be used as a PCMCIA card and a digital film
card for a digital camera. See column 6, lines
1-4.
Column 7, lines 55-57 states that "[a]n actual
LBA received from host 504 (a host-provided
LBA) identifies a sector of information."
The reference meets the limitation of the
claim.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/806,136

Art Unit: 2186

the data of said plurality of clusters in said one
segment is distributed and arranged into said
first sub-block 730 of a first flash memory
plurality of storages.
chip 670 and a second sub-block 731 of a
flash memory chip 672. See also, column 8,
lines 8-11.

Estakhri does not clearly show that "one segment is constructed by a plurality of clusters."

However, Smith discloses of a method for operating a flash memory such as the one described by Estakhri wherein the flash memory comprises at least one partition of data storage locations. See Smith, column 2, lines 2-5. Also, see figure 2 of Smith. While not explicitly disclosed, the plurality of blocks in Estakhri is arranged into at least one partition like the one shown in figure 2 of Smith. The said partition reads on the claimed "segment." In the alternative, it would have been obvious to partition the non-volatile memory described by Estakhri as suggested by Smith for the purpose of permitting large portions of data to be written and read from the non-volatile memory at one time as was suggested by Smith on column 1, lines 63-65.

As to claims 2-3, see the comments for claim 1 above.

As to claim 4, see figure 8A, the LBA-PBA map 800. See also, column 10, lines 6-9.

As to claim 5, note offset bits 812 shown in figure 8B.

As to claim 6, and the limitation that the writing be "in parallel" the examiner notes that in Estakhri data is written two multiple nonvolatile memory devices simultaneously (that is "in Application/Control Number: 09/806,136 Page 6

Art Unit: 2186

parallel"). See column 21, lines 56-58. Also, the examiner notes that in *Estakhri* "after [] sectors [] have been written [] sectors that were not re-accessed during the write operation are moved" (which reads on the claimed "distributing and arranging the data of said plurality of clusters in one segment into said plurality of storages.") See column 17, lines 23-27.

8. Claim 6 is alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Estakhri/Smith combination in view of Brown (USPN: 6,038,636).

As to the limitation of "distributing and arranging the data of said plurality of clusters in one segment into said plurality of storages" the examiner notes that those of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to "defragment" the nonvolatile device described by the <code>Estakhri/Smith</code> combination for the purpose of providing a sufficient amount of contiguous free space to satisfy a storage request. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to "defragment" the non-volatile device described by the <code>Estakhri/Smith</code> combination because the <code>Estakhri/Smith</code> <code>/Brown</code> combination would have allowed for providing a sufficient amount of contiguous free space to satisfy a storage request. Defragmentation would have met the claimed "distributing and arranging."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this or an earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to Yamir Encarnacion by phone at (703) 308-5466.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim, can be reached on (703) 305-3821.

Application/Control Number: 09/806,136 Page 7

Art Unit: 2186

Any formal response to this action intended for entry should be mailed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to (703) 746-7239 and labeled "FORMAL" or "OFFICIAL." Any informal or draft communication should be faxed to (703) 746-7240 and labeled "INFORMAL" or "UNOFFICIAL" or "DRAFT" or "PROPOSED" and followed by a phone call to the Examiner at the above number. Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

YEE

Yamir Encarnacion

Patent Examiner

November 20, 2002

MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100